arXiv:1402.2122v1 [nlin.CD] 10 Feb 2014

POSITIVE-ENTROPY HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS ON NILMANIFOLDS VIA SCATTERING

LEO T. BUTLER

Abstract. Let Σ be a compact quotient of T_4, the Lie group of 4×4 upper triangular matrices with unity along the diagonal. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}_4$ of T_4 has the standard basis $\{X_{ij}\}$ of matrices with 0 everywhere but in the (i, j) entry, which is unity. Let g be the Carnot metric, a sub-riemannian metric, on T_4 for which $X_{i,i+1}$, $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, is an orthonormal basis. Montgomery, Shapiro and Stolin showed that the geodesic flow of g is algebraically non-integrable.

This note proves that the geodesic flow of that Carnot metric on $T\Sigma$ has positive topological entropy and is real-analytically non-integrable. It extends earlier work by Butler and Gelfreich.

1. Introduction

Let G be a connected nilpotent Lie group with discrete subgroup D and let $\Sigma = G/D$ be the corresponding homogeneous space. Each homogeneous (sub-)riemannian metric on G induces a locally-homogeneous metric on Σ. These *left-invariant* geometries are interesting both geometrically and dynamically. A basic question is

Question 1.1. *Which left-invariant geodesic flows on a compact nilmanifold have zero topological entropy?*

Let T_n be the nilpotent group of upper triangular $n \times n$ real matrices with unity on the diagonal. Montgomery, Shapiro and Stolin [6] investigate the geodesic flow of a Carnot metric on T_4; they show that it reduces to the Yang-Mills hamiltonian flow which is known to be algebraically non-integrable [9, 10]. In [2], metrics on compact quotients of the 3-step nilpotent Lie group $T_4 \oplus T_3$ are constructed whose geodesic flows have positive topological entropy. In [3], Butler & Gelfreich showed that there are riemannian and sub-riemannian metrics on T_4 which have positive topological entropy. Numerical analysis in that paper suggested that the Carnot metric of Montgomery, Shapiro and Stolin has a horseshoe, hence positive topological entropy, and is analytically non-integrable. This note proves those numerical results are, in fact, correct. In that paper, a Melnikov integral is expressed in terms of scattering data for a second-order scalar differential equation; in the present paper, this scattering data is explicitly computed in terms of Γ-functions.

The Lie algebra of T_4, $\mathfrak{t}_4$, has the standard basis consisting of those 4×4 matrices X_{ij} with a unit in the i-th row and j-th column, $i < j$, and zeros everywhere else. We will restrict attention to those structures $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle$ where $\langle X_{ij}, X_{kl} \rangle = b_{ij}$ when $i = k, j = l$ and zero otherwise. The standard riemannian metric has $b_{ij} = 1$ for all i, j; the standard Carnot sub-riemannian metric studied in [6] has $b_{12} = b_{23} = b_{34} = 1$ and all other coefficients zero.

Date: February 11, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37J30; 53C17, 53C30, 53D25.

Key words and phrases. Sub-riemannian geometry; nilmanifold; topological entropy; geodesic flows.

The author thanks Adri Olde Daalhuis for his helpful comments on an early draft of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Σ be a homogeneous space of T_4. The topological entropy of the geodesic flows of the standard riemannian and Carnot metrics is positive.*

This theorem is proven by reducing the flows to hamiltonian flows on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$, the dual of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}_4$ of T_4. The Poisson sub-algebra of left-invariant hamiltonians on T^*T_4 is naturally identified with the hamiltonians on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$ with the natural Poisson structure. The Lie group's co-adjoint action is by Poisson automorphisms and a co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{t}_4^*$ is a symplectic submanifold to which all such hamiltonian vector fields are tangent. A quadratic hamiltonian $h : \mathfrak{t}_4^* \to \mathbf{R}$ is *diagonal* if it is expressed as $h = \sum_{i<j} a_{ij} X_{ij}^2$ for some constants a_{ij}.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $h : \mathfrak{t}_4^* \to \mathbf{R}$ be a diagonal hamiltonian with $a_{13}a_{34} = a_{12}a_{24}$ and let E_h be the hamiltonian, or Euler, vector field of h on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$. There is an open set of regular co-adjoint orbits $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{t}_4^*$, such that $E_h|\mathcal{O}$ has a horseshoe. In particular, the Euler vector field of the standard Carnot metric has positive topological entropy and is real analytically non-integrable.*

Theorem 1.2 is proven by expressing a Melnikov integral as a quadratic form in 2-variables with coefficients that are obtained by solving a scattering problem; these coefficients are naturally expressed in terms of Γ-functions involving a parameter, called α below, that depends on the metric coefficients a_{ij} and the co-adjoint orbit. Note that [3] asserts that the horseshoe exists on all but countably many regular co-adjoint orbits; this is inaccurate. That paper shows the horseshoe exists for all but countably many *real* values of the invariant α; however, α may be *imaginary* on an open set. This is explained in figure 1 below. As noted in [3], when $a_{13} = 0$, the invariant α is constant and one cannot therefore conclude that there is a horseshoe on any of the co-adjoint orbits. The standard Carnot metric of [6] falls into this case ($\alpha = 1$). The present paper uses an alternative approach that shows the existence of a horseshoe for all non-zero real values of α. This is strong enough to prove the existence of a horsehoe on an open set of co-adjoint orbits, even when a_{13} vanishes. It remains an open question if the Euler vector field has a horseshoe on a co-adjoint orbit where α is imaginary.

Theorem 1.2 implies, from the structural stability of the horseshoe, that there is an open set W of quadratic hamiltonians on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$ each of which has a horseshoe; further, the $\mathrm{Aut}(T_4)$ orbit of W has this property, too. This motivates the following:

Question 1.2. *Does there exist a quadratic hamiltonian on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$ which induces a non-degenerate (sub-)riemannian structure on T_4 and which is completely integrable or has zero topological entropy?*

If one drops the non-degeneracy condition, then the answer is trivially yes to both questions, as witnessed by $h = X_{14}^2$, which is a Casimir.

1.1. **Outline.** This note is organized as follows: section 2 reviews the derivation of the Melnikov form from [3]; section 3 computes the integrals that arise in the Melnikov form in terms of the scattering matrices at $\pm\infty$ in a general scattering problem; section 4 demonstrates the non-degeneracy of the Melnikov form for the particular form arising from section 2 and completes the proof of theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

2. Background

This section recalls a number of facts about left-invariant hamiltonian systems on the cotangent bundle of a Lie group; see also [5, 3].

2.1. **Poisson geometry of left-invariant hamiltonians.** A *Poisson manifold* is a smooth manifold M such that $C^\infty(M)$ is equipped with a skew-symmetric bracket $\{,\}$ that makes $(C^\infty(M),\{,\})$ into a Lie algebra of derivations of $C^\infty(M)$. The centre of $(C^\infty(M),\{,\})$ is the set of *Casimirs*. A Casimir is a first integral of all hamiltonian vector fields.

The dual space of a Lie algebra gives an example of a Poisson manifold that is not (in general) a symplectic manifold. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a finite-dimensional real Lie algebra and let $\mathfrak{g}^*$ be the dual vector space of $\mathfrak{g}$. $T^*_p\mathfrak{g}^*$ is identified with $\mathfrak{g}$ for all $p\in\mathfrak{g}^*$. The Poisson bracket on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is defined for all $f,h\in C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ and $p\in\mathfrak{g}^*$ by

$$\{f,h\}(p) := -\langle p,[df_p,dh_p]\rangle\,, \tag{1}$$

where $\langle\bullet,\bullet\rangle:\mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{g}\to\mathbf{R}$ is the natural pairing. Recall that for $\xi\in\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathrm{ad}^*_\xi:\mathfrak{g}^*\to\mathfrak{g}^*$ is the linear map defined by $\langle \mathrm{ad}^*_\xi p,\eta\rangle = -\langle p,[\xi,\eta]\rangle$. $\mathrm{ad}^*:\mathfrak{g}\to gl(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ is the co-adjoint representation. For any $h\in C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^*)$, the hamiltonian vector field $E_h=\{\bullet,h\}$ equals $-\mathrm{ad}^*_{dh(p)}p$.

Let G be a connected Lie group whose Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}$. The adjoint representation of G on $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathrm{Ad}_g\xi=\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}\,g\exp(t\xi)g^{-1}$, induces the co-adjoint representation $\langle \mathrm{Ad}^*_g p,\xi\rangle = \langle p,\mathrm{Ad}_{g^{-1}}\xi\rangle$ for all $p\in\mathfrak{g}^*$, $g\in G$ and $\xi\in\mathfrak{g}$. As each vector field $p\to\mathrm{ad}^*_\xi p$ is hamiltonian on $\mathfrak{g}^*$, with linear hamiltonian $h_\xi(p)=-\langle p,\xi\rangle$, the co-adjoint action of G on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ preserves the Poisson bracket. The orbits of the co-adjoint action are called the co-adjoint orbits. Each co-adjoint orbit is a homogeneous G-space, and *every* hamiltonian vector field on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is tangent to each co-adjoint orbit. For this reason, the Poisson bracket $\{\bullet,\bullet\}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ restricts to each co-adjoint orbit, and is non-degenerate on each co-adjoint orbit. Thus, the co-adjoint orbits are naturally symplectic manifolds. A Casimir is necessarily constant on each co-adjoint orbit, and in many cases (as in this paper) each co-adjoint orbit is the common level set of all Casimirs.

The hamiltonian flow of a left-invariant hamiltonian H on T^*G has the equations of motion:

$$X_H(g,p)=\left\{\begin{array}{rcl}\dot g &=& T_eL_g dh(p),\\ \dot p &=& -\mathrm{ad}^*_{dh(p)}\,p,\end{array}\right. \tag{2}$$

The reduction of the vector field X_H to $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is the Euler vector field E_h.

2.2. **Poisson geometry of T^*T_4.** The Lie algebra of T_4 is

$$\mathfrak{t}_4=\left\{\left[\begin{array}{cccc}0&x&z&w\\0&0&y&u\\0&0&0&v\\0&0&0&0\end{array}\right]\;:\;u,v,w,x,y,z\in\mathbf{R}\right\}.$$

Let $p_\bullet$ be the coordinate functions on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$ dual to the above coordinates on $\mathfrak{t}_4$. The Poisson bracket on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$ is:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\{p_x,p_y\}=-p_z, & \{p_x,p_u\}=-p_w,\\ \{p_y,p_v\}=-p_u, & \{p_z,p_v\}=-p_w.\end{array} \tag{3}$$

There are two independent Casimirs of $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$ are $K_1(p)=p_w$, $K_2(p)=p_wp_y-p_zp_u$. Let $K:\mathfrak{t}_4^*\to\mathbf{R}^2$ be defined by $K=(K_1,K_2)$. The level sets of K are the co-adjoint orbits of T_4's action on $\mathfrak{t}_4^*$ and will be denoted by $\mathcal{O}_k$, where $k=(k_1,k_2)$. We will say that $\mathcal{O}_k$ is a *regular co-adjoint orbit* if $k_1\neq 0$.

Lemma 2.1. *Each regular co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_k$ is symplectomorphic to $T^*\mathbf{R}^2$ equipped with its canonical symplectic structure.*

Proof. Indeed, the right-hand column of the commutation relations (3) shows that when $k_1=p_w\neq 0$, the coordinates (p_x,p_u,p_z,p_v) are conformally symplectic and the first column is a consequence of $K_2=k_2$ constant on $\mathcal{O}_k$. See [3]. □

2.3. **The hamiltonians.** Let $a_{ij} \geq 0$ be constants such that $a_{12}a_{23}a_{34} \neq 0$ and $a_{13}a_{34} = a_{12}a_{24}$. Define

$$4h(p) = a_{12}p_x^2 + a_{23}p_y^2 + a_{13}p_z^2 + a_{24}p_u^2 + a_{34}p_v^2 + a_{14}p_w^2 \tag{4}$$

As shown in [3], there is a change of coordinates that transforms $h|\mathcal{O}_k$ to

$$2\mathbf{h}_k = (x^2 - \xi X^2 + \nu X^4) + (y^2 + \omega Y^2 + \nu Y^4 - 2\nu X^2 Y^2), \tag{5}$$

where (x, X, y, Y) are canonically conjugate coordinates, $\xi = -(a_{13}a_{34}k_1^2 + a_{23}k_2\sqrt{a_{12}a_{34}})$, $\omega = \xi + 2a_{13}a_{34}k_1^2 = a_{13}a_{34}k_1^2 - a_{23}k_2\sqrt{a_{12}a_{34}}$.

The Casimirs may be rescaled to $c_1 = \sqrt{a_{13}a_{34}}k_1$ and $c_2 = a_{23}k_2\sqrt{a_{12}a_{34}}$. In this case, $\xi = -c_1^2 - c_2$ and $\omega = c_1^2 - c_2$. The ratio $\frac{\omega}{\xi}$ is negative when $\xi < 0 < \omega$, that is, when $c_1^2 > c_2 > -c_1^2$. Otherwise, either $\xi < \omega < 0$ or $0 < \xi < \omega$. If $e > 0$, the energy level $\{\mathbf{h}_k = e\}$ intersects the set S of Casimir values where the ratio $\frac{\omega}{\xi} > 0$, i.e. where the origin is a saddle-centre for $\mathbf{h}_k$ (figure 1). In the degenerate case where $a_{13} = 0$, $c_1 \equiv 0$ and the ratio $\omega/\xi \equiv 1$, except when $c_2 = 0$, where it is undefined.

FIGURE 1. The regions in the space of rescaled Casimir values where (5) has saddle-centre (S) and centre-centre (C) equilibria at the origin.



2.3.1. *The geodesic flow and Euler equations.* When $\frac{\omega}{\xi} > 0$, there is a second change of variables that transforms $\mathbf{h}_k$ into a constant multiple of

$$2\mathbf{h} = x^2 + \left(X^2 - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + y^2 + \alpha^2 Y^2 + Y^4 - 2X^2Y^2. \tag{6}$$

For all $\epsilon > 0$, the rescaling $(y, Y) \mapsto (y, Y)/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ transforms the hamiltonian vector-field of $\mathbf{h}$ (equation 6) to the non-hamiltonian vector-field

$$\mathcal{X}_\epsilon = \begin{cases} \dot{X} = x, & \dot{Y} = y, \\ \dot{x} = X - 2X^3 + 2\epsilon XY^2, & \dot{y} = \left[-\alpha^2 + 2X^2\right] Y - 2\epsilon Y^3. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

2.3.2. *The normally hyperbolic manifold S.* The plane

$$S = \{(x, X, y, Y) \ : x = X = 0\}$$

is $\mathcal{X}_\epsilon$-invariant for all ϵ. As shown in [3], S is normally-hyperbolic for all ϵ.

2.3.3. *The stable and unstable manifolds of S.* The function $h : T^*\mathbf{R}^2 \to \mathbf{R}$, $h = x^2 + (X^2 - \frac{1}{2})^2$ is a first integral of $\mathcal{X}_0$. The set $h^{-1}(\frac{1}{4})$ is the stable and unstable manifold of S, which we denote by $W_0^{\pm}(S)$. On $W_0^{\pm}(S) - S$, the flow of $\mathcal{X}_0$ satisfies

$$\begin{array}{rclcrcl} X &=& \pm\operatorname{sech}(t+t_0), & & x &=& \mp\tanh(t+t_0)\operatorname{sech}(t+t_0), \\ Y &=& c_0Y_0(t+t_0) + c_1Y_1(t+t_0), & & y &=& \dot{Y}, \end{array} \tag{8}$$

where $X(0) = \pm\operatorname{sech}(t_0), x(0) = \mp\tanh(t_0)\operatorname{sech}(t_0)^2$ and $\{Y_j\}$ is a basis of solutions to the initial-value problem

$$\ddot{Y} + \left[\alpha^2 - 2\operatorname{sech}(t)^2\right] Y = 0, \qquad \begin{array}{l} \text{such that } Y(0) = Y_{0,j}, \dot{Y}(0) = \dot{Y}_{0,j} \\ \text{and } W = Y_{0,0}\dot{Y}_{0,1} - Y_{0,1}\dot{Y}_{0,0} \neq 0 \end{array} \tag{9}$$

while $Y(0) = c_0Y_0(t_0) + c_1Y_1(t_0)$, $y(0) = c_0\dot{Y}_0(t_0) + c_1\dot{Y}_1(t_0)$. The particular choice of basis is discussed in section 4.

Given a basis of solutions, this determines a coordinate system (t_0, c_0, c_1) on the stable and unstable manifolds $W_0^{\pm}(S)$ of S for $\mathcal{X}_0$.

2.3.4. *The Melnikov function.* By well-known results [4], the perturbed stable and unstable manifolds of S, $W_\epsilon^{\pm}(S)$ for $\mathcal{X}_\epsilon$ are, on compact sets, graphs over $W_0^{\pm}(W)$. The Melnikov function m measures the $O(\epsilon)$ separation of these graphs. In this case, it is a quadratic form in the coordinates c_0, c_1 [3]:

$$m(t_0, c_0, c_1) = m_{00}c_0^2 + 2m_{01}c_0c_1 + m_{11}c_1^2 \qquad \text{where} \tag{10}$$

$$m_{ij} = \int_{\tau\in\mathbf{R}} \dot{q}(\tau)\, Y_i(\tau)\, Y_j(\tau)\, \mathrm{d}\tau, \qquad \text{and } q(\tau) = 2\operatorname{sech}(\tau)^2. \tag{11}$$

3. Improper integrals via scattering

In [3], the coefficients m_{ij} are computed in terms of the asymptotic phase angle between an even and odd solution to (9). This section examines an alternative route to computing the coefficients m_{ij} for a general class of scattering problems and integrals like those in (11).

Definition 3.1. *Two functions $f, g \in C^1(\mathbf{R})$ are said to be* asymptotically equal *at $+\infty$, written $f \underset{+}{\sim} g$, if, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $T > 0$ such that*

$$t \geq T \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad |f(t) - g(t)| + |f'(t) - g'(t)| < \epsilon. \tag{12}$$

The definition of asymptotic equality at $-\infty$ is similar and denoted by $\underset{-}{\sim}$.

Let $q \in C^1(\mathbf{R}) \cap L^1(\mathbf{R})$ and $\alpha > 0$. Since $q \underset{\pm}{\sim} 0$, there are solutions $w_j^{\pm}$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$, to the differential equation

$$\ddot{w} + [\alpha^2 - q(t)]\, w = 0 \tag{13}$$

such that

$$w_j^{\pm}(t) \underset{\pm}{\sim} \exp((-1)^j i\alpha t). \tag{14}$$

Given two solutions w_0, w_1 to (13)–which are not necessarily the solutions (14)–, let

$$J_\pm = \lim_{\pm t\to\infty} \dot{w}_0(t)\dot{w}_1(t) + \alpha^2 w_0(t)w_1(t). \tag{15}$$

Since, for each $\sigma \in \{\pm\}$, $\{w_0^\sigma, w_1^\sigma\}$ is a basis of the solution space to (13), there are constants a_{ij}^σ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} w_0 \\ w_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{00}^\sigma & a_{01}^\sigma \\ a_{10}^\sigma & a_{11}^\sigma \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_0^\sigma \\ w_1^\sigma \end{bmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

Lemma 3.1. *The limits* (15) *exist and are equal to*

$$J_\sigma = 2\,\alpha^2\, [a_{01}^\sigma a_{10}^\sigma + a_{00}^\sigma a_{11}^\sigma], \qquad \text{for } \sigma \in \{\pm\}. \tag{17}$$

Proof. Let σ be $+$ or $-$. One sees that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dot{w}_0\dot{w}_1 + \alpha^2 w_0 w_1 \\
&= (a_{00}^\sigma \dot{w}_0^\sigma + a_{01}^\sigma \dot{w}_1^\sigma)(a_{10}^\sigma \dot{w}_0^\sigma + a_{11}^\sigma \dot{w}_1^\sigma) + \alpha^2 (a_{00}^\sigma w_0^\sigma + a_{01}^\sigma w_1^\sigma)(a_{10}^\sigma w_0^\sigma + a_{11}^\sigma w_1^\sigma) \\
&\underset{\sigma}{\sim} -\alpha^2 (a_{00}^\sigma \exp(i\alpha t) - a_{01}^\sigma \exp(-i\alpha t))(a_{10}^\sigma \exp(i\alpha t) - a_{11}^\sigma \exp(-i\alpha t)) \\
&\quad + \alpha^2 (a_{00}^\sigma \exp(i\alpha t) + a_{01}^\sigma \exp(-i\alpha t))(a_{10}^\sigma \exp(i\alpha t) + a_{11}^\sigma \exp(-i\alpha t))
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (17). □

Theorem 3.1. *Let w_0, w_1 be solutions to* (13)*. The integral*

$$I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{q}(t)\, w_0(t)\, w_1(t)\, \mathrm{d}t \tag{18}$$

exists and equals $J_- - J_+$, that is,

$$I = 2\,\alpha^2 \left[a_{01}^- a_{10}^- + a_{00}^- a_{11}^- - a_{01}^+ a_{10}^+ - a_{00}^+ a_{11}^+\right]. \tag{19}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that in [3]. Let $I_\sigma = \sigma \int_0^{\sigma\infty} \dot{q}(t)\, w_0(t)\, w_1(t)\, \mathrm{d}t$ for $\sigma \in \{\pm\}$, so that $I = I_+ + I_-$. Integration by parts shows that $I_+ = -J_+ + C$ and $I_- = J_- - C$ where $C = [\alpha^2 + q(0)]\, w_0(0) w_1(0) + \dot{w}_0(0)\dot{w}_1(0)$ is a boundary datum. □

The following is useful in computing the Melnikov coefficients m_{ij} (11).

Corollary 3.1. *Let I_{ij} denote the integral* (18) *with $w_0 = w_i^-$ and $w_1 = w_j^-$ for $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$. Then*

$$I_{ii} = -4\alpha^2 a_{i0}^+ a_{i1}^+ \qquad I_{01} = I_{10} = 2\alpha^2(1 - a_{00}^+ a_{11}^+ - a_{01}^+ a_{10}^+) \tag{20}$$

where $[a_{ij}^+]$ is the connection matrix (16)*. Moreover*

$$\det[I_{ij}] = -4\,\alpha^4 \left((1 - a_{00}^+ a_{11}^+ - a_{01}^+ a_{10}^+)^2 - 4 a_{00}^+ a_{11}^+ a_{01}^+ a_{10}^+\right). \tag{21}$$

4. The scattering coefficients and splitting of the invariant manifolds

To compute the m_{ij} in (11), it is useful to transform the differential equation (9) into a form that reveals its solubility in terms of hypergeometric functions. Substitution of $z = \tanh(t)$ transforms the differential equation (9) into the Legendre differential equation [8, p. 324]

$$(1 - z^2)Y'' - 2zY' + \left(\nu(\nu + 1) - \frac{\mu^2}{1 - z^2}\right) Y = 0, \tag{22}$$

where $\mu = i\alpha$, $\nu = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{-7}}{2}$ and $' = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}z}$.

Let $F(a, b; c; z)$ be the $(2, 1)$ hypergeometric function with moduli $a, b, c \in \mathbf{C}$ and argument $z \in \mathbf{C}$ [8, p. 281], [7, §15.2.1]. There are four privileged solutions to (22) that are expressed in terms of these hypergeometric functions, namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_0^+ &= \left[\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right]^{\frac{i\alpha}{2}} F(a, b; c; \frac{1-z}{2}) \qquad Y_1^+ = \left[\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right]^{-\frac{i\alpha}{2}} F(a, b; \bar{c}; \frac{1-z}{2}) \\
Y_0^- &= \left[\frac{1-z}{1+z}\right]^{\frac{i\alpha}{2}} F(a, b; c; \frac{1+z}{2}) \qquad Y_1^- = \left[\frac{1-z}{1+z}\right]^{-\frac{i\alpha}{2}} F(a, b; \bar{c}; \frac{1+z}{2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $a = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{-7}}{2}$, $b = \bar{a}$ and $c = 1 - i\alpha$ [8, p. 286]. (The notation is explained thus: the group $\mathbf{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbf{Z}_2$ acts by automorphisms of (22) by changing the sign of α

and z independently.) From the fact that as $\pm t \to \infty$, $\pm z \to 1$ and $F(a,b;c;0) = 1$, it is apparent that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0^+ &\underset{+}{\sim} \exp(i\alpha t) & Y_1^+ &\underset{+}{\sim} \exp(-i\alpha t) \\ Y_0^- &\underset{-}{\sim} \exp(i\alpha t) & Y_1^- &\underset{-}{\sim} \exp(-i\alpha t), \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

viewed as functions of $t = \tanh^{-1}(z)$.

The linear transformation rules for hypergeometric functions [1, 15.3.3, 15.3.6] imply the relations

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0^- &= AY_0^+ + BY_1^+, & Y_1^- &= \bar{B}Y_0^+ + \bar{A}Y_1^+ & &\text{where} \\ A &= \frac{\Gamma(c)\,\Gamma(1-c)}{\Gamma(a)\,\Gamma(b)} & B &= \frac{\Gamma(c)\,\Gamma(c-1)}{\Gamma(c-a)\,\Gamma(c-b)} \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

so the connection matrices are

$$[a_{ij}^-] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad [a_{ij}^+] = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ \bar{B} & \bar{A} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{26}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $s = \sqrt{7}/2$. Then*

$$|B|^2 = \frac{\cosh(2\pi\alpha) + \cosh(2\pi s)}{\cosh(2\pi\alpha) - 1}, \qquad |A|^2 = \left(\frac{\cosh(\pi s)}{\sinh(\pi\alpha)}\right)^2. \tag{27}$$

So, $|B|$ exceeds unity for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}, \alpha \neq 0$ and $|A|/|B|$ is maximized at $\alpha = 0$ and decreases monotonically to 0 as $\alpha \to \infty$.

Proof. Assume that $x \neq 0$. The reflection formula for the Γ-function implies that $|\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + ix)|^2 = \dfrac{\pi}{\cosh(\pi x)}$, $|\Gamma(ix)|^2 = \dfrac{\pi}{|x \sinh(\pi x)|}$ and $|\Gamma(1+ix)|^2 = \dfrac{\pi|x|}{|\sinh(\pi x)|}$ [1, ¶ 6.1.17, 6.1.29–31]. Then, since $c = 1 - i\alpha$ and $c - a = \frac{1}{2} + i(-\alpha - s)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |B|^2 &= \left| \frac{\Gamma(1-i\alpha)\,\Gamma(-i\alpha)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + i(-\alpha - s))\,\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + i(-\alpha + s))} \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{\cosh(\pi(-\alpha - s))\,\cosh(\pi(-\alpha + s))}{\sinh(\pi\alpha)^2} \end{aligned}$$

which yields the first part of (27) and implies $|B| \geq 1$ and > 1 if $\alpha \neq 0$. A similar computation shows the second part. This implies that

$$|A|^2/|B|^2 = \cosh(\pi s)^2 / \left(\cosh(\pi s)^2 + \cosh(\pi\alpha)^2 - 1\right) \leq 1$$

and < 1 when $\alpha \neq 0$ and decreases monotonically as $\alpha \to \infty$. □

Theorem 4.1. *The Melnikov form with coefficients m_{ij} (11) for the basis $Y_j = Y_j^-$ is non-degenerate and indefinite for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}, \alpha \neq 0$.*

Proof. When corollary 3.1 is applied, with the connection coefficients in (25), one computes that $m_{ij} = I_{ij}$ so

$$\det[m_{ij}] = -4\,\alpha^4\,((1 - |A|^2 - |B|^2)^2 - 4|A|^2|B|^2). \tag{28}$$

By hypothesis, $\alpha \neq 0$, so $\det[m_{ij}]$ vanishes iff $|A| \pm |B| = \pm 1$. By lemma 4.1, the only possible equation to be satisfied is $|A| = |B| - 1$. If this latter equation is satisfied, then

$$[\cosh(\pi s) + \sinh(\pi\alpha)]^2 = \cosh(\pi s)^2 + \cosh(\pi\alpha)^2 - 1,$$

which implies that $\alpha = 0$. Therefore, $\det[m_{ij}] \neq 0$ for all real, non-zero α.

Indefiniteness of the Melnikov form follows from the even-ness of the potential $q(t) = -2\,\mathrm{sech}(t)^2$: non-trivial even and odd solutions to (9) exist and the Melnikov form vanishes on these solutions by Theorem 3.1. □



(a) (b)

FIGURE 2. 2(a), Fundamental solutions to the differential equations (9) with $\alpha = 1$. 2(b), Left axis: the integral I (19) as a function of α with the solutions in figure 2(a). 2(b) Right axis: the asymptotic phase angle β between even & odd solutions Y_0 & Y_1 of (9).

Remark 1. Let us compare the results for the Melnikov form (11) to that obtained in [3]. The Melnikov form $[m_{ij}]$ relative to the basis $\{Y_0^+, Y_1^+\}$ has been computed to be

$$M_y = -2\alpha^2 \begin{bmatrix} 2AB & |B|^2 + |A|^2 - 1 \\ |B|^2 + |A|^2 - 1 & 2\bar{A}\bar{B} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{29}$$

Let W_0, W_1 be a pair of solutions whose Wronskian matrix is the identity at $z = 0$; in particular, W_0 (resp. W_1) is an even (resp. odd) solution. The Melnikov form in this basis is equal to

$$M_w = \underbrace{2\alpha \cot(\beta)}_{I(\alpha)} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{30}$$

The change of variables formula for quadratic forms implies that $\det M_y = (-2i\alpha)^2 \times \det M_w$, where the first term on the right arises from the Wronskian of $\{Y_0^+, Y_1^+\}$. This implies that

$$4\cot(\beta)^2 = 4|A|^2|B|^2 - \left(1 - |A|^2 - |B|^2\right)^2. \tag{31}$$

From this, and lemma 4.1, one can numerically compute the phase angle β and the integral I as functions of α. These are depicted in figure 2(b). In [3, Figure 1], these quantities were determined by numerically solving the initial-value problem 9. The absolute and relative errors between the closed form solutions from equation (31) and the numerical approximations in [3] are depicted in figure 3. This figure shows the approximations are extremely good, with a mean absolute error of approximately 1.6×10^{-9}.[1] One can also show that $I(0^+) = -2\cosh(\sqrt{7}\pi/2)/\pi \cong -20.317$, which is in close agreement with figure 2(b).

REFERENCES

1. Milton Abramowitz and Irene A. Stegun (eds.), *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1992, Reprint of the 1972 edition. MR 1225604 (94b:00012)
2. Leo T. Butler, *Invariant metrics on nilmanifolds with positive topological entropy*, Geom. Dedicata **100** (2003), 173–185. MR 2011121 (2004j:37116)

[1] The angle B reported in [3, Figure 1] equals $\pi + \beta$ in the present paper.

FIGURE 3. Error in numerical integration of $I(\alpha)$ vs. closed form.



3. Leo T. Butler and Vassili Gelfreich, *Positive-entropy geodesic flows on nilmanifolds*, Nonlinearity **21** (2008), no. 7, 1423–1434, With online multimedia enhancements. MR 2425326 (2009g:37026)
4. M. W. Hirsch, C. C. Pugh, and M. Shub, *Invariant manifolds*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 583, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977. MR 0501173 (58 #18595)
5. Jerrold E. Marsden and Tudor S. Ratiu, *Introduction to mechanics and symmetry*, second ed., Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 17, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999, A basic exposition of classical mechanical systems. MR 1723696 (2000i:70002)
6. R. Montgomery, M. Shapiro, and A. Stolin, *A nonintegrable sub-Riemannian geodesic flow on a Carnot group*, J. Dynam. Control Systems **3** (1997), no. 4, 519–530. MR 1481625 (98h:53069)
7. A. B. Olde Daalhuis, *Hypergeometric function*, NIST handbook of mathematical functions, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Washington, DC, 2010, pp. 383–401. MR 2655355
8. E. T. Whittaker and G. N. Watson, *A course of modern analysis. An introduction to the general theory of infinite processes and of analytic functions: with an account of the principal transcendental functions*, Fourth edition. Reprinted, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1962. MR 0178117 (31 #2375)
9. S. L. Ziglin, *Bifurcation of solutions and the nonexistence of first integrals in Hamiltonian mechanics. I*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **16** (1982), no. 3, 30–41, 96. MR 674006 (85j:58066a)
10. ———, *Bifurcation of solutions and the nonexistence of first integrals in Hamiltonian mechanics. II*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **17** (1983), no. 1, 8–23. MR 695092 (85j:58066b)